

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

GURPREET SINGH,
Plaintiff,
v.
RIO CONSUMNES CORRECTION
CENTER,
Defendant.

Case No. 2:24-cv-01831-JDP (PC)

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

RESPONSE DUE WITHIN TWENTY-ONE
DAYS

On August 12, 2024, defendant filed a motion to dismiss. ECF No. 6. To date, plaintiff has not filed a response.

To manage its docket effectively, the court requires litigants to meet certain deadlines. The court may impose sanctions, including dismissing a case, for failure to comply with its orders or local rules. *See Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b); E.D. Cal. L.R. 110; Hells Canyon Pres. Council v. U.S. Forest Serv.*, 403 F.3d 683, 689 (9th Cir. 2005); *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988). Involuntary dismissal is a harsh penalty, but a district court has a duty to administer justice expeditiously and avoid needless burden for the parties. *See Pagtalunan v. Galaza*, 291 F.3d 639, 642 (9th Cir. 2002); *Fed. R. Civ. P. 1*.

I will give plaintiff a chance to explain why the court should not dismiss the case for his failure to file an opposition or statement of non-opposition to defendant's motion. Plaintiff's

1 failure to respond to this order will constitute a failure to comply with a court order and will result
2 in a recommendation that this action be dismissed. Accordingly, plaintiff is ordered to show
3 cause within twenty-one days why this case should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute and
4 failure to comply with local rules. Should plaintiff wish to continue with this lawsuit, he shall
5 file, within twenty-one days, an opposition or statement of non-opposition to defendant's motion.

6
7 IT IS SO ORDERED.
8

9 Dated: October 9, 2024


10 JEREMY D. PETERSON
11 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28